D. E.
DEFEATED:
OR, A
REPLY
TO
A Late Scurrilous Pamphlet
Vented against the
Lord Bishop of *Worcester's* Letter,
Whereby he Vindicated himself from
Mr. *BAXTER'S* Misreports.

By *S. H.*

Qui benè audire velit, loquatur benè.
Sen.

LONDON:
Printed for *R. Royston*, and are to be sold by *John Jones* Bookseller in *Worcester*. M. DC. LXII.

61-5455

Preface to the *READER.*

Courteous Reader,

THink not that I have presum'd to defend his Lordship's Letter, or arrogated to my self the support of his Epistolary *treatise. No, I know his Merits to be out of the reach of Detraction, his Person beyond the venom of the most maligning Spleen; and his Letter to transcend all rational Exception. My design therefore is, to stop the mouth of this unmanner'd* Coridon; *whose Drift is to build himself a Name in the Slander of Grandees, and to become notorious by exposing deserts to the malice and misprizion of disaffected Persons.*

There are, I know, many inconveniences that might have scar'd me from the enterprize. I am not unacquainted with the Epidemical fate of those who have ingag'd into Controversies, in that they commonly encounter an unhappy Dilemma; for upon any (though never so inconsiderable an) Answer, they must either gratifie their Adversary by a resolved Silence, or else sweat in the invincible Cacoethes of a frequent Reply. Besides this; to affrighten me, there was a Bear in the way: for the Person (against whom I have rays'd the weapons) hath incurr'd an honourable Scandal in the mouths of some, who have reputed him a Make-bate Jesuite; But this difficulty I vanquished in a short and easie meditation, for (although I knew he might easily be induc'd to make as virulent a Discovery of his Malice, yet) I could never be tempted to believe that a Jesuite would ever have befriended us with such an ample disclosure of

his ignorance. And indeed this was the ground on which I overcame one of the forementioned Præmunire's of the Preſs, not dreading even the quotidian iteration of his Reply, whoſe indiſcretion ſufficiently ſatisfy'd me of my Security. So that the encouragement which animated me to the cloſure with D.E. *(for that is all the ear-mark we have of him) lies obvious and viſible. But yet (Gentle Reader) the Suit that ſent me to thy Courteſie, remans ſtill undiſcovered.*

Deſiring thee therefore to know, that I have dealt more fairly with his, than he with his Lordſhips Letter, (not ſnapping at a few glean'd Particulars; but replying to the moſt conſiderable part thereof) I muſt foreſtall thy further view with a double Requeſt, (1) That I may be excuſed in that I have rebandied language of his own Complexion upon him; finding no unſuitableneſs in that advice, viz. Anſwer a fool according to his folly, *&c. (2) That I may be diſpens'd with, in that I have not made it my buſineſs ſo much to entertain thee with demonſtrative Arguments, in behalf of thoſe things which* D.E. *ſcruples; as by ſatisfactory Anſwers to inform thee of the invalidity of his exceptions. Since I thought it the ſtrongeſt probation of thoſe aſſertions, at which he carps, to expoſe to thy view the vanity and emptineſs of his Allegations againſt them. Moreover, I ſhould probably have wrought him into ſome partial conceit of himſelf, had I anſwer'd his Pamphlet with a Volume. However, waive not the reading of theſe few leaves out of any deſpondency of ſatisfaction, till thy peruſing eye ſhall acquaint thee with the Contents.*

Thine, &c.

S. H.

D. E.

DEFEATED:

OR, A

REPLY

TO

A Late Scurrilous Pamphlet

Vented againſt the

Lord Biſhop of *WORCESTER*, &c.

I *Am* (ſaith *D. E.*) *to thank you for the laſt piece of Divertiſement you gave me in ſending the 'Biſhop of* Worceſter's *Letter.* The Spleen of *Democritus* was nothing to the humour of this fellow. His life (to whom ſuch ſolid matters were but Divertiſements) was ſure very jocular; and the merry temper of other Naturals, falls much beneath it. But he proceeds: *And I wiſh you would have let me enjoy'd the ſatisfaction I took in reading it without engaging me to give you my ſenſe upon it. Senſe* did he call it? I ever thought Senſe to have been a little more of kin to Reaſon. But I am ready to gratifie him ſo far, as to father the miſtake on the Printer, and to ſuppoſe it ſhould have been *Non-ſenſe.* But

ſenſe let it be; and let him give his Patron this his ſenſe; I think he was ſo generous in giving it, that he improvidently reſerv'd none at all for himſelf. But he annexeth, *For beſides my unwillingneſs to engage in a perſonal quarrel, I think it will not be very ſafe medling with ſo angry an adverſary.* Never fear it Man! Never fear it! *Scarabæos contemnunt Aquilæ.* Think not that he will adopt to himſelf ſo much unquietneſs as to deam of you. What though he be a Man of worth and eminence? yet, his Gravity will not diſpenſe with his entertaining fools in his thoughts, or encouraging a red Cap with notice and obſervation. Next, *D. E. reſolves to ſpeak nothing but truth in the Character he intends to give him, and it is briefly this, That in fewer leaves he never read more paſſion. Spectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis?* I thought his ſenſe would come to this anon. He pretends to give us a Character of the Biſhop, and he tells us the Contents of his Book. His preceding words promiſe an appoſite Deſcription of his Lordſhips perſon, and his next ſyllables acquaint us with nothing at all to the purpoſe, but only, *that in fewer leaves* D. E. *never read more paſſion.* Well, for once then let me preſent the Reader with a Character of the *Biſhop*; and 'tis briefly this, That *D. E.* is an arrant Aſſe. Both deſcriptions are alike to the purpoſe. But he tells us, *that the Biſhops book is full of paſſion*; And is there not in our Authors Reply, a thouſand times more of Malice and Rankour (I dare not ſay, *Paſſion*; for that's ſoly incident to rational creatures)? But, *the Biſhops paſſion is ſo predominant, that his diſorderly and abrupt ſtile doth altogether partake of it.* He accuſes a ſtyle compos'd of Gravity, as blended with abruption and bitterneſs, whereas his partakes of either (the laſt eſpecially) in a far more intenſe degree. 'Twas an Errata ſure in the Satyriſt, *Dum vitant ſtulti vitia, in contraria currunt.* For here's one or'e head and ears in Raillery, whileſt he not only pretends to eſchew it, but hath the face even to declare againſt it. Next we are informed, that *the Biſhops beſt way will be to get his heat miſtaken for zeal; for elſe it may juſtly be accounted*

counted somewhat of a worse name, and which in the Dog-dayes will be very dangerous. Though *D. E.* belies the Lord Bishop's Letter as savouring of heat; yet I'me sure tis far from abuse or scandal; to pronounce the quintessence of *D. E.* his Pamphlet, vapour and smoak. But may we not justly admire how our Pamphleter came acquainted with the danger of the Dog-dayes, or the influence of a Star? unless perhaps by barking against the Moon, to which custom he hath not yet bid adieu. If I might be of his Counsel, I should advise him, as his best course, not to pretend to Astronomy, whom a *Cudgel* doth better become than a *Jacob's staff.*

Our Replicant makes no long abode on the controverted Question, either because he did not well understand the State, and was loath to display his ignorance: Or else, because he could not find a plausible occasion to vent that Rancour, from the exuberant supplies of which, he hath borrowed a Ninefold Exception against some particular occurrences in the Lord Bishop's Letter, where he suppos'd himself capable of fastening. Indeed he would perswade us, that 'twas his inclination to *Favour the Bishop*, made him waive the main Dispute. But thanks be to his *Ignorance*, rather than his *Clemency.* However, though I cannot believe him, yet I will not stand to question him, but wait upon him in his Exceptions.

I. Except.

He takes much in dudgeon that Assevetation of the reciprocal alliance between Kings and Bishops, in the Proverb, *No BISHOP, no KING.* Neither doth *D. E.* see any Dependence they have each on other, thinking *Episcopacy to contribute little or nothing to the subsistence of the King's Authority.* But we must desire him

to

to be informed, that this Cohærence doth (although ſomething, yet) not ſo much reſult from any poſitive reſpect in themſelves; as from that inconſiſtency which is between any other Eccleſiaſtical Government, and *Kingſhip*. For either we muſt ſuppoſe an æquality of Degrees amongſt Eccleſiaſtical Perſons; or elſe the præeminence and ſuperiority of *Lay-Elders*, (for I know no other Eccleſiaſtick ſtate whereunto any have inclined) now what a diametrical antipathy and oppoſition either of theſe two Conditions bear to a *Regall Supremacy*, is eaſily demonſtrated. For, as to the firſt, ſhould we ſuppoſe all Church-perſons, or Miniſters, empowr'd with equal authority, that indiſtinction would redound no leſſe to his Majeſty's diſadvantage in Spirituals, (every man being in a poſture to broach his own opinion, or promote another's faction) than the Confuſion of a ſecular power in Leveldom, would endammage the Kings Temporal Domination. Or, ſecondly, Were we under the py-ball'd diſpoſing of Laicks; how could they (according to the exaction of their duty) devote themſelves to the Churches benefit? Since their double Intereſts would oblige them to diſtraction, and a damnable Neutrality that would juſtifie *Eraſmus* his Anomalous ſtate of being. Which, how far it would impair the Churches happineſs, and conſequently plunder one ballance of the Kings Soveraignty (whoſe Eccleſiaſtical and Temporal State muſt counterpoiſe each other, that the Crown ſtand even) I leave to the judgement of any rational man.

But to inquire into our Animadverter's Reaſons that prompted him to the diſavowing of any ſuch relation.

1. Saith he, *Kings flowriſhed in all parts of the World, before Biſhops were ever heard of. And there can no reaſon be Given, why what hath once been, may not with the ſame terms of Covenience be again.* As to the firſt aſſertion (*viz.* that the Antiquity of Kings doth far ſurpaſſe that of Biſhops) I muſt needs acknowledge it the trueſt propoſition in all the

the Pamphlet. For none can be ignorant that *Ninus* the first *Assyrian* Monarch flourish't without the least support of a Bishop. We know that *Zoroastres Magus*, first King of the *Bactrians*, and the first writer that History presents unto us, neither had Bishops in his Kingdom, nor yet ever mentioned such a Name in those books he legacy'd to posterity. Neither do we read that *Crœsus*, *Cyrus*, *Darius*, *Philip* of *Macedon*, or his Son *Alexander*, made use of Bishops. So that had *D. E.* left us nothing partaking more of falsity than this Position, I should never have questioned him. But yet when all this is *pro confesso*, I wonder by what Inference and deduction, he could tell us that we may with the *same terms of convenience* admit the *same posture of Government again?* For (1) What though he should tell us, that the *Mogul*, *Prester John*, or the Great *Cham* of *Tartary*, do to this day preserve their Magnificence, without the least concurrence of an Episcopal Jurisdiction? Doth it therefore follow, that a Christian King may? They may also subsist without a Church, yea and do; but, is there the same *Convenience* for a King in *Christendom*, so to do? Where there is no *Ecclesiastick* State, cannot be expected *Ecclesiastick* Government. But where a Kings Prerogative hath a double aspect (towards Spirituals, and towards Temporals) there is required some jurisdiction in either; to which, States of a contrary constitution can neither prescribe *Names* nor *Method*. Their Regimen without Bishops, doth not at all involve any possibility of the same among us. (2) What though *D. E.* could (although he never can) prove, that even *Christian Kings* have flourished without Bishops? Yet, doth it follow that *England* (for the Proverb was neither derived from, nor is extended to, exotick Nations) may with the same facility dispence with the privation of them? Why should the Sequel be good? Why should other people become a necessary president to us? Or, why should our Capacities be measured by their Discipline? Since our humours are of another countenance, and (for the security of his Majesty) may require a Government partaking somewhat of singularity in Church;

as well as distinct from others in State. Or (3), Should we suppose (for δημονστρationis gratiâ, we may suppose ἀδύνατα and impossibles) even in *England*, a Power called *Kingship* without Bishops; yet the veracity of the Maxim (*No Bishop, no King*) would stand firm and unshaken. For the Authority of a *King*, (as a *King*) is unconfin'd and absolute, without the least *Apocope*, mutilation, or restriction of Command. And a King is not γνησιος, or naturally call'd a King, when his lustre is eclips'd in the derogating from his Soveraignty. So that, I say, although we should suppose a Monarchical Government, pretending to the name of Kingship, to be destitute of Bishops; yet it would not follow, that it would shine in its due splendour (and consequently be *Kingship* properly so termed) without them. For the other two Ecclesiastick States (which some have dream'd of) would (as I said before) if not ruine, yet, diminish his Majesties Authority, and make his *Kingship* and *Regal Power* dwindle into something of a more inconsiderable name. So that, without his Bishops, he would not be a King properly so called. We have seen that grosse *Non-sequitur* of *D. E.* viz. *Kings have flourished without Bishops*; ergo, *they may still.* But this is only the first of his Reasons which made him Scruple the mutual Relation of Kings and Bishops.

2. Saith *D. E. Bishops, as they are by law Established in England, are purely the Kings subordinate Ministers, in the Management of Ecclesiastical affairs, which his Majesty may confer upon what order of men he pleaseth, though as much lay-persons as you and I.* Hence, he concludes that there is no necessity of such a mutual respect between Kings and Bishops. Whether our Pamphleter be a Laick or no? I list not here to enquire, although his Ignorance bespeaks him to be somewhat worse. When he wrote this, he did it in so great simplicity, that his left hand knew not what his right hand did. For the question is not, Whether his Majesty may invest a Laick with Ecclesiastick dignities and promotions? but, Whether he may do it without detri-

ment

ment *to his Kingdom*, and the unavoydable ruines of a Glorious Church, without which his Kingship would be at an ebb? We do not so fart detract from his Majesty's Power, as to avow that he cannot substitute *Mechanicks* in Church-discipline; But we say, that if He should do it, it would not a little tend to the disadvantage, prejudice, yea, subversion of his Kingly Power. And whence then doth *D. E.* conclude the nullity of that coherence between *Kings and Bishops?* There is a difference between the Kings doing a thing, and his doing it with safety. The King may infringe the connexion betwixt him and Bishops, by his discarding them; But he cannot maintain his Regal Authority in such a dis-union. Hence then, 'tis absolutely false, and nothing deductive from his premisses, which *D. E.* infers, *viz. That 'tis very injurious to the King's authority to averr, that he could not otherwise uphold himself, than by preserving the undue, and (as some think) Antichristian prælation of his inferiour officers.* Speak out man! Some think quoth a? The Man is loath to accuse himself, but presents it to us under the frantick conceit of his Brethren. *Antichristian?* Methinks, his own thoughts might have convinc'd him of the falsity of that passion; and he might have concluded a Bishop to have been no kin to *Antichrist*, since then, A Prelate and *D. E.* would have been better friends.

3. He will have us believe that *Bishops are so little useful to support the Regal dignity, that none have been greater enemies to the Kings undoubted Soveraignty than some Bishops.* Where we may observe the weakness of his Reason. Some Bishops have abused the Kings trust; therefore there is no reason why *Episcopacy* should be entail'd to *Kingship.* The same reason may be alleadged against Nobility, since some Nobles have employ'd their honours and capacities to the distraction of the Kingdom and the endammagement of his Majesty; hence might we conclude (did the method of *D. E.* hold good), that the King may subsist without his Nobles. Or, what if we should recriminate, on those *Presbyterians* who have surmis'd

as well as distinct from others in State. Or (3), Should we suppose (for *demonstrationis gratiâ*, we may suppose ἀδύνατα and impossibles) even in *England*, a Power called *Kingship* without Bishops; yet the veracity of the Maxim (*No Bishop, no King*) would stand firm and unshaken. For the Authority of a *King*, (as a *King*) is unconfin'd and absolute, without the least *Apocope*, mutilation, or restriction of Command. And a King is not γνησῶς, or naturally call'd a King, when his lustre is eclips'd in the derogating from his Soveraignty. So that, I say, although we should suppose a Monarchical Government, pretending to the name of Kingship, to be destitute of Bishops; yet it would not follow, that it would shine in its due splendour (and consequently be *Kingship* properly so termed) without them. For the other two Ecclesiastick States (which some have dream'd of) would (as I said before) if not ruine, yet, diminish his Majesties Authority, and make his *Kingship* and *Regal Power* dwindle into something of a more inconsiderable name. So that, without his Bishops, he would not be a King properly so called. We have seen that grosse *Non-sequitur* of *D. E.* viz. *Kings have flourished without Bishops*; ergo, *they may still*. But this is only the first of his Reasons which made him Scruple the mutual Relation of Kings and Bishops.

2. Saith *D. E. Bishops, as they are by law Established in England, are purely the Kings subordinate Ministers, in the Management of Ecclesiastical affairs, which his Majesty may confer upon what order of men he pleaseth, though as much lay-persons as you and I.* Hence, he concludes that there is no necessity of such a mutual respect between Kings and Bishops. Whether our Pamphleter be a Laick or no? I list not here to enquire, although his Ignorance bespeaks him to be somewhat worse. When he wrote this, he did it in so great simplicity, that his left hand knew not what his right hand did. For the question is not, Whether his Majesty may invest a Laick with Ecclesiastick dignities and promotions? but, Whether he may do it without detri-

ment

ment *to his Kingdom*, and the unavoydable ruines of a Glorious Church, without which his Kingſhip would be at an ebb? We do not ſo farr detract from his Majeſty's Power, as to avow that he cannot ſubſtitute *Mechanicks* in Church-diſcipline; But we ſay, that if He ſhould do it, it would not a little tend to the diſadvantage, prejudice, yea, ſubverſion of his Kingly Power. And whence then doth *D. E.* conclude the nullity of that coherence between *Kings and Biſhops?* There is a difference between the Kings doing a thing, and his doing it with ſafety. The King may infringe the connexion betwixt him and Biſhops, by his diſcarding them; But he cannot maintain his Regal Authority in ſuch a diſ-union. Hence then, 'tis abſolutely falſe, and nothing deductive from his premiſſes, which *D. E.* infers, *viz. That 'tis very injurious to the King's authority to averr, that he could not otherwiſe uphold himſelf, than by preſerving the undue, and (as ſome think) Antichriſtian prælation of his inferiour officers.* Speak out man! Some think quoth a? The Man is loath to accuſe himſelf, but preſents it to us under the frantick conceit of his Brethren. *Antichriſtian?* Methinks, his own thoughts might have convinc'd him of the falſity of that paſſion; and he might have concluded a Biſhop to have been no kin to *Antichriſt*, ſince then, A Prelate and *D. E.* would have been better friends.

3. He will have us believe that *Biſhops are ſo little uſeful to ſupport the Regal dignity, that none have been greater enemies to the Kings undoubted Soveraignty than ſome Biſhops.* Where we may obſerve the weakneſs of his Reaſon. Some Biſhops have abuſed the Kings truſt; therefore there is no reaſon why *Epiſcopacy* ſhould be entail'd to *Kingſhip.* The ſame reaſon may be alleadged againſt Nobility, ſince ſome Nobles have employ'd their honours and capacities to the diſtraction of the Kingdom and the endammagement of his Majeſty; hence might we conclude (did the method of *D. E.* hold good), that the King may ſubſiſt without his Nobles. Or, what if we ſhould recriminate, on thoſe *Presbyterians* who have ſurmis'd

a *Parliament* eſſential to the Kingly Government, and tell them that ſome of the Parliament have made Treaſon the deſign of many conſultations, therefore the King might and ought to ſubſiſt without any ſuch Butteresſes and Appendixes of Domination? Sure, they would much grumble at ſuch an Argument. And *D. E.* would think little reaſon in it. But let us ſee, what ground he had to blemiſh any of the Biſhops, with ſtyling them *Enemies to the Kings undoubted Soveraignty*. They are ſo, ſaith he, *either by their ſcarce warrantable intermedling in Civill affairs*. Had he but inſtanced in ſome of thoſe affairs (as his malice would eaſily have done, had not his ignorance countermanded it), I ſhould have known better how to Reply. For I know no Secular buſineſs wherein any of them have, or do Authoritatively concern themſelves, or wherewith they do intermingle; unleſs the things be ſuch, as, carrying a double nature, have a greater allyance with Eccleſiaſtical, than Temporal Conſiderations; their by as directing towards the Church-intereſt. And as for their medling with ſuch matters, I ſee not how *D. E.* could term them Unwarrantable, or Prejudicial to the Kings undoubted Soveraignty. But this is not all the reaſon of his abuſing Biſhops, but the ſecond way whereby he deems them the Kings Enemies, is, *By their abſurd and inſignificant diſtinguiſhing between Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes, whereby they mangle the Kings Authority, leaving him no Supremacy, as to Church-matters, but the Name.* Whether our Author be a fit diſcerner of inſignificant diſtinctions, let any judge. Why ſhould the differencing and diſcriminating of Cauſes into *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtick*, be more abſurd than the diſtinguiſhing of perſons into ſuch? Beſides, who ſees not what a Scandalous lie he hath here vented? Whith what face could he ſay that the King is allowed no Soveraignty in Church-affairs, but only nominal, when his Majeſty may and doth like, diſapprove, regulate, determine, and diſpoſe of them, how and when he himſelf pleaſeth? So that (although *D. E.* would falſely perſwade us the contrary) the Popes pretenſions are of a nature

nature contradiſtinct to thoſe of our Biſhops; ſince his Supremacy admits of no acknowledgment of ſubordination. So that, the Pope is no more of kin to our Biſhops, than *D. E.* to Truth and Honeſty. If our Pamphleter be ſo good at lying, I ſhould ſcarce truſt him this dear year, leſt he ſhould exerciſe his skill in another faculty. But he proceeds: *If the Biſhop of* Worceſter's *Rule hold good,* ——Crimine ab uno, Diſce omnes, —— i. e. *that all men of a party may be judged by the miſcarriage of one, then you may judge by the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *what the reſt drive at.* What pains doth *D. E.* take in an expoſition? He would fain perſwade us that he underſtands Latin; when, it may be, he was obliged to the Civility of a *Rider*'s Dictionary. As for his retorting that ſentence —— *Crimine ab uno, Diſce omnes* —— (urg'd by my Lord of *Worceſter* upon *The Presbyterians*) let me tell him, 'twas done without the leaſt dram of underſtanding. For, although we ſhould grant to *D. E.* that this one Biſhop (though it can never be proved) is guilty of Uſurpation, yet the Phraſe cannot with the ſame reaſon be rebandied on Epiſcopacy through his default, who is farre from engroſſing the name of *Prelacy*; as it was objected firſt againſt the *Presbyterians* becauſe of the miſdemeanour of Mr. *Baxter*, who pretends to the Monopoly of *Presbytery*, arrogating to himſelf the anteſignation and repreſentment of all the reſt.

The Vanity of *D. E.* his firſt exception is ſufficiently diſcovered; I ſhall alſo make bare the inſufficiency of the reſt.

II. EXCEPT.

II. Except.

OUR Pamphleter takes it very ill that the Biſhop of *Worceſter ſhould call himſelfe the ſole Paſtor of all the Congregations in his Dioceſe.* Deeming that ſuch a poſition muſt needs be defended by the Arguments produced in behalfe of the *Pope's* Supremacy. I wonder, what could introduce into his thoughts ſuch a concluſion? or what could ſuggeſt that the ſame muſt be the Reaſon for a Biſhops ſuperintendency over one particular Dioceſe, and in ſubordination to his *Majeſty's* command; and for the *Pope* to aſſume the univerſall command of all churches, without the acknowledgement of any higher Power to which he ſhould ſubmitt? I wonder whence *D. E.* derives ſuch dreams, as that there ſhould be a parity of reaſon and Convenience, for his *Holyneſſe's* governing the Church by ſuch a populous plurality of Subſtitutes, as that it is utterly impoſſible for him to make particular inquiſition into the execution of their functions; And for A *Biſhop's* adopting to himſelfe a limited number of deputies, whoſe more neighbouring deportments he may with much facility ſurvay and determine of them according to their known actions? What will any man judge but that *D. E.* his witts were at *Rome* all this while? But he informes us *That he forbears to urge how contrary this Practice is to the Doctrine of the Apoſtles Paul, and Peter (hoping the* Biſhop *will not take it angrily, that he did not call them* Saints, *Since that theſe holy men did not need any ſtyle of honour out of the the Pope's Kalender* The Saints are very little oblig'd to the Charity of this irreverent fellow, who will not give them what they deſerve, but what they need; And their Neceſsities, not their Merits, muſt preſcribe a proportion to their titles. But why do not Biſhops follow the Doctrine of theſe Apoſtles? *Paul*, ſaith he, *had ſent for the Elders of the Church of Epheſus bidding them feed the Church*

of

of God over which (not he himſelfe by his ſole authority as Biſhop of the Dioceſe but) *the Spirit had made them* ἐπισκόπους i. e. *Overſeers.* And did the Spirit (I wonder) immediately without any inſtrumentall Cooperation of St. *Paul,* make them overſeers? Or doth the Biſhop now pretend to make Men overſeers without any reſpect had to the Influence of the Spirit? Wherein then lies the difference between the Biſhop's practiſe and the Apoſtles Doctrine? O, but πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος *with them ſignifie the ſame.* Tis true, ſometimes they did ſignifie the ſame, yet they were not allwayes of the Same Extent. Every one that was πρεσβύτερος and no more, might in ſome ſenſe be calld ἐπίσκοπος but not *è converſo,* Every Biſhop or overſeer could not be calld a *Presbyter,* and no more. For my part I will not envy the term ἐπίσκοπος to the moſt undeſerving prieſt, in it's genuine ſignification. But withall, I would have *D. E.* know, that a Community of name doth not alwayes involve an indiſtinction of dignity, or a parity of degree; Elſe would I enquire, why St. *Paul*) who was alſo ἐπίσκοπος) did ſo imperiouſly ſummon the reſt? Or what plea St. *Peter* could produce for his Commanding the miniſters to feed the Flock (as *D. E.* himſelfe tells us): Which two occurrences are ſo far from patronizing our *Replicant's* Aſſeverations, that they utterly defeat them; Manifeſtly holding forth a diſparity of eminence and command. I would deſire him therefore to be inform'd, that Cuſtom is guilty neither of Blaſphemy nor hereſy (the Degrees being ſtill the ſame with thoſe of the Apoſtles) in the reſtriction of the title. A Scholar (I will not ſay *D. E.*) knowes that ἄγγελος formerly was a word equally appropriated to men and Spirits, employ'd in embaſsies; but now the eminence of the latter hath engroſſ'd the Name, eſpecially in it's tranſlations; as likewiſe the κατ' ἐξοχὴν-neſs of the Biſhops office hath attracted the uſe of the title ἐπίσκοπος

In the next place, we are told (to detract from the Epiſcopal power) that *Whoever feed the flock are under Chriſt (Whom the Apoſtle terms the Chief-Shepheard) the next and immediate*

immediate paſtours of the flock, though his wits were gone a wool-gathering, and now I have found them among the flock. In the firſt of his *Exceptions* he is ſtrongly provok'd againſt Biſhops; as detracting from his *Majeſty's Eccleſiaſtick* prerogative: And yet here, he thinks it no impeachment to the Kings ſupremacy, to give the moſt inconſiderable prieſt the upper hand of him in ſpiritualls. Twas well he diſcovered no more of his name than *D. E.* eſe this ſentence might chance to have made his neck crack, ſince it ſavours little better than reaſon. For I would willingly know of him, whether the Paſtour of the Flock be not the Governour of the flock? If that he be (as he cannot deny it), then, whoſoever feeds that flock is next and immediately under Chriſt ſupream governour in Eccleſiaſticals, and the immediate head of the Church next to God; for *D. E.* tells us that he is the immediate, and, conſequently, next to God, the ſupream Paſtour. So farewell to one of his Majeſty's titles. Is not this to be a moſt affectionate lover of the Kings perſon and Government, as he elſewhere pretended? But he tells us moreover, that, *To extend the power beyond the actuall care of feeding, is a Notion altogether unſcripturall.* Unleſs I am as farre out of the way as our Authour and Animadvertour is out of his wits, here is a falſe κατάθεσις; wherein he takes it for granted that a Biſhops care is not actuall. How unwarily doth he confound thoſe two termes *actuall* and *Immediate* (which laſt he would have ſaid, and ſo have excluded the Kings power from moſt parochiall congregations in England) thinking them of the ſame import and ſignification. If *D. E.* did underſtand what, *actuall*, meant, he would know that a mediate care (ſuch as Epiſcopal) is likewiſe actual. The word ſignifying nothing elſe than, exiſtent and in Act. Let us a little (for illuſtration) ſuppoſe an owner of a great flock dividing them into ſeverall parts, giving them to the tuition of one Paſtor; he diſtributing them to the Care of others, whoſe executing of their office he ſupreviſeth: Will *D. E.* ſay that this Supraviſour doth not take an actuall care of the flock? or that he is not the

ſhepheard

ſhepheard more immediate to the Owner? Or that he may not diſpoſe of the more inferiour paſtours *pro arbitrio*, alwayes reſpecting their actions and his Maſter's permiſſion; Or that there is the ſame reaſon for ones feeding by vicegerents, whom by reaſon of their multitude and remotion he cannot overſee; and for another's deputation of feeders, whom by reaſon of their paucity and vicinity he may eaſily ſurvey? I think he will not, although his indiſcretion and malevolence might counſell him to the aſsertion.

III. Except.

He calls it *A light and unſeemly trifling with ſacred Writ to underſtand the words ſpoken concerning thoſe that go not in by the door (and are therefore theeves and Robbers) of ſuch Miniſters as preach to Congregations without the Biſhop's licenſe.* Little dreams he, that they are called theeves and (Robbers not as preaching only to Congregations, for ſo they do but come in the wrong way, but) as they preach out of a deſigne to prejudice and plunder the true Shepheard. And indeed ſuch poſtick irruptions imply ſomething of a malevolent Complexion; and the enſuing practiſes of ſuch intruders have bin an ample Comment on thoſe preceding deſignes that encourag'd them to the Attempt. But he tels us that, *If beſides ordination there muſt be a Licenſe, then* (1) *He knows not what Ordination mean's.* Indeed I am eaſily induc'd to believe this latter Clauſe. He doth not know, that ther's a difference between the power and the place of Miniſtration, the Capacity and the place wherein to execute the Capacity. The Dignity and office of feeding is conferred at Ordination, but not the power to feed where he liſt, but where he ſhould have leave; leſt he ſhould treſpaſſe upon other mens incloſures, and undermine and ſupplant other paſtours, (2) Saith he, *For one Miniſter of the Goſpell (for Certainly a Biſhop is no more)*. No certainly, he is no more then one, unleſs he had the *Presbyterian* faculty of a double

heart and a double tongue: But yet this one is of a more dilated power and pre-eminence; but what of him? *For him to ſilence his Fellow-Miniſter* (But fellow-miniſter is not *hayl fellow well met*; they are fellows in the ſame function, but not in the ſame degrees of Dignity in that function), *for no other reaſon but for preaching without a new licenſe* (A new licenſe? pray firſt let them have an old one) *this is an abuſe of dominion and contrary to the firſt ages of the Church.* This we muſt take *gratis*, *D. E.* being as farre unacquainted with primitive tranſactions, as he is at defiance to ſound Reaſon. What if *D E.* never read of ſuch a practiſe in the Church, doth it therefore neceſſarily follow, that there was no ſuch practiſe? Or, what if there was no ſuch Cuſtome? Are there no cuſtomes laudable, but adequately thoſe which decayed Antiquity hath bequeathed us? Probably, the tender and Infant-Church could not away with a diſcipline ſo accurate, as that which it's more Virile-conſtitution doth exact. The uninquiſitive humours of men in thoſe dayes, contented themſelves in the fruition of the Goſpel, without any pronity to Schiſm. Men being more ſedulous in perſwading to a down-right faith, did not then require ſuch Cautions towards their preaching, as the now adays unſatisfy'd Curioſities, which byaſs'd-men towards diſtraction, ſeem to call for.

Our Saviour (ſaith our Animadverter) ſilenc'd the Phariſes by ſtrength of Argument, *Which the Biſhop of Worceſter may do, when he is able.* I confeſſe, he would have a difficult task, and *D. E.* may defye all Chriſtendome upon the Same account. For the beſt hopes in ſuch an enterpriſe would find unhappy fruſtration. For they may as well preſume to ſilence Thunder, as by rationall perſwaſions to ſtop the mouths of thoſe clamorous *Presbyterians*; who before they will, by a reaſonable Silence, ſeem to relinquiſh their long-ſince defeated Cauſe, will not ſtick to croud whole Volumes with abſurdities; And rather then they'l appeare deſtitute of a Reply, their Adverſary ſhall hear of them in *D E.* his railing Dialect, and in *Huckſters* Rhetorick.

rick. The only way then, of silencing such, must be by constraint. O but, *Our Saviour was so farr from Silencing the Pharisees from preaching, that he commands his disciples both to hear and obey their Doctrine.* But it was to obey their Doctrine, as (1) they preached the Law, not as they vented Schism and declared Faction. (2) 'Twas comparatively, rather to square their lives by the Pharisees doctrine than by their practise, that Christ enjoyned his disciples: (3) 'Twas to vouchsafe the Pharisees audience, as they were legally authorized, and because they sate in Moses chaire: so that the Reason is of a farre different aspect for the not forbidding of the Pharisees, and the toleration of *Mr Baxter*. Moreover (4) the Pharisees preach'd the *Prophets*, which Prophets discovered the *Messiah*; and so their preaching might advance *Christ*'s Kingdome: whereas the preaching of Nonconformists and such like, would be so farr from promoting, that it would bury *Christ*'s Kingdome in the ruines of a distracted Church and a divided Realm. But briefly, since the ends of our Saviour's tolerating the *Pharisees* are not fully known, conveniency ought somewhat more to be respected, than imitation in this matter. For, should there be a sufferance of preachers, though (with the *Pharisees*) blaspheming; why might not there be an indulging forbearance allowable to persons or ministers, though morally and notoriously offending? Which thing *D. E.* himself (pag. 5. lin. 2.) acknowledgeth, as sufficient ground of Silencing and ejection.

I wish therefore that *D. E.* and the rest of his tribe (if any be so simple and inconsiderate to be of his Society) would remember, that as, they speake evill of Dignities, and resist the Power which God hath ordained: so, they shall receive their due reward (though no satisfaction) for it? As likewise for all such Pamphlets publish'd by them for the propagation of Sedition.

IV. Except.

How conſiſtent with the Civill Peace (*for as to Chriſtian Charity he thinks the whole thing but a letter of defiance againſt it*) *the Biſhops diſtinction is about the Act of Indemnity, He Hopes his Majeſty will in due time conſider. For the Biſhop*, ſaith he, *is ſo hardy as to tell us, that though the King had pardoned the Corporall puniſhment; yet the Church ought not to remit the Scandall till amends were made by Confeſſion.* 'Tis pitty but *D. E* were of his Majeſty's privy Councell, that he might prove his remembrancer. But I pray, what Reaſon is there, why he who hath bin prejudiciall to the Church ſhould not make a due acknowledgment of his delinquency, before his re-admiſſion to his former priviledges? Is there not a grand diſcrimination between the remiſſion of a man's puniſhment, and the re-admiſſion into preferment? We ought to do good to our enemies in forgiving private injuries, but not in promoting, them ſo long as by their non-recantation they ſeem to avow their former fact, and to maintain a poſture contradictory to the Churche's welfare. And how is this Diſtinction repugnant to the Civill Peace? Or rather, Is it not more adverſant thereunto, to preferre the men or forget the injury, when they not confeſſing do adhere to their former principles? This were for the Church, only to take care that thoſe (who are in a ſtrong probability of doing her an injury) ſhould be put in a Capacity to effect any of their deſignes; or at leaſt to contribute to their ſecurity by taking no notice of them. The Church exacting a Recantation reſpects not ſo much their paſt faults as their preſent poſture of Hoſtility. But Alas! what doth this word, Church, meane? Here *D. E. could have wiſhed that the Biſhop would have ſpoken out of the Clouds, and plainly told whether By the Church, he meant a Congregation of the faithfull*; *or Archbiſhops, Biſhops* &c. I ſee I am miſtaken, for I thought that *D. E.* his foggy braine could have apprehended

prehended things ſpoken in a Cloud, better than thoſe deliver'd in the cleer Sunſhine. Well: If I might preſume to gueſse at the *Reverend Father's* meaning, I would tell *D. E.* that by the word, Church, he underſtands neither the Congregation, excluding Archbiſhops, Biſhops &c. nor yet theſe, abſtracted from the Congregation, but both together. So that *D. E.* (though ignorantly) play's the Sophiſter, arguing *à benè conjunctis ad malè diviſa.* Hence 'tis that he labours with a falſe Suppoſition, That *Archbiſhops, Biſhops* &c. did exact a recantation, as perſons diſtinct from the Congregation; whereas they only act as Chiefs, Governours, and Repreſentatives of the reſidue of the Church or Congregation. Now if *D. E.* will ſay that the Congregation hath no Coercive power at all (as he doth aſſert), then would I fain know, By what power the antient Church excommunicated; whether it were not by conſtraint and force? which (if, *D. E.* underſtands the word) is all one with Coercive. Yea but,

Why ſhould the Church force a Recantation for ſuch things as the King and Parliament commanded never more to be remembred? Alas man, we look not ſo much on the Acts of hoſtility already preterlapſed and forgiven; as on thoſe whereunto they ſtand in a readineſſe, ſo long as they declare themſelves, unconvinc'd of their Crimes; I know that the non-conformiſts or others (who have manifeſted their activity in the late commotions) have their actions forgiven them; but the remiſſion of paſt facts, doth not ſecure the Church for futurity, ſo long as their non-recanting ſeem's to approve their precedent actings, and to warrant any other proceedings to come, of the ſame nature. The Church may and doth forgive offences paſt, but is not bound to diſpenſe with thoſe preſent poſtures, that ſeem to allow the late extravagancies, and to maintain the Scandall. But we are ask'd, *What can more enrage men to take Wild and forbidden Courſes than to ſee preachers ſtrive to widen their wounds, and contrary to their former profeſſions pull off the plaiſters, which the State-Phyſicians had provided for our diſtempers?* Had our Pamphleter meant this of the

Presbyterian faction, the expreſſions had been appoſite, and well applyed to their Natures. But ſince his owne conſtruction, will ſcarce authorize or aſſent to ſo much truth, We ſhall anſwer his Quæry with another Interrogatory. What then can more force a Conſtraint than to ſee ſuch preache s as Mr. *Baxter*, (contrary to their iterated declarations) vent ſedition, and not only widen the wounds of the Church, but even make them ſtink? I'me ſure, ſuch Empiricks as theſe, deſerve a purgation. As for *D. E.* I think him to be dangerouſly troubled with black Choler, for the remedy whereof he hath vomited prety largely againſt the Fathers of the Church; And as ſoon as the humour ſhall increaſe to the redintegration of his diſtemper, we muſt expect ſuch another Evacuation.

V. Except.

With what irreverence doth *D. E.* grumble, and call it bold and impious, to aſſert, *That if to command an act, which by accident may prove the occaſion of ſin, be ſinfull, then God himſelfe can command nothing?* Since, ſaith he, *A thing which by accident may be ſinfull, may be unlawfull in another to command for want of ſufficient Authority.* And ſo is every thing elſe; Though we ſhould ſuppoſe an Injunction utterly devoyd of Sin, either in it ſelfe or in it's conſequences; yet would be unlawfull, if proceeding from an unlawfull Authority. So that we ſee that *D. E.* never ſpeaks but when his Mouth's open. He gives us a very good reaſon, why a thing may be unlawfull, viz, becauſe it may be unlawfull. The Queſtion is, Whether a thing may be unlawfull, as it may ocaſion ſin? *D. E.* anſwers, that it may be unlawfull as it proceeds from an unlawfull power. The Quære is, Whether a thing that is ſinfull *per accidens*, under that formality and *eò quòd* ſinfull *per accidens*, be lawfull to be commanded? And he tells us, 'Tis unlawfull, *eò quòd* the Authority is unlawfull. We enquire, whether a command be illegitimate, becauſe the thing commanded

manded is ſinful accidentally and by conſequence? And he replies, that the command is illegitimate, becauſe the Authority commanding is ſo. Which how much it is *ad Rhombum*, let any rational man conſider. And how little it impeaches the *Lord Biſhops* conſequence, the weakeſt capacity may ſee. Still then it remains unſhaken, that if a thing being ſinful by conſequence be ground ſufficient to render a thing unlawfull; God himſelf can command nothing, ſince he cannot command any thing but what may by conſequence be made ſin.

Beſides, *D. E.* goes againſt all rules of diſpute falling upon the *hypotheſis of the Queſtion*, for (the diſpute being concerning his Majeſty) they ſuppoſed the power commanding to be lawfull and beyond exception. Only, our Pamphleter had a mind tacitly to hint out treaſon to us, and to whiſper an illegitimacy entaild on the Kings Authority, and conſequently on all his edicts and *Mandamus's*

VI. Except.

I Cannot but think it a reaſonable and very ſolid Poſition of the Lord Biſhop, *That an offence to which a diſproportionable penalty is annexed, is not to be meaſured by the abſtracted Quality of the Act, but by the miſchievous Conſequences it may produce.* Since the forfeiture ought alwaies to bear proportion to the danger, and a greater penalty ſhould be proclaimed to ſcare men from ſuch actions, which (though puny and contemptible in themſelves) are attended with populous and peſtilent inconveniencies. But our wiſe Pamphleter is ſure, *that in Divinity nothing is more falſe and dangerous. Hey, pas, preſto!* Here ye ſhall have me, and there ye ſhall have me. In the firſt *Exception*, *D. E.* preſents himſelf in a grey coat, and the falſe beard of a Laick, But here he perſonates another man, and pretends to Divinity. How doth he make himſelf an Ambodexter, an Hermaphrodite of Religion: A two fac'd

pump

pump, *hinc Angelum ferens, illinc Cacodæmonem?* He would ſerve for a good poſt in croſſe-waies, directing to ſeverall roads at once. I never took him for any other than a Fool in a Play, and he to juſtifie my conjecture hath here produced his Coat of ſeveral colours; I will not ſay, it ſhews like *Kiderminſter ſtuffe*. But this I am ſure, *D. E.* is a *Linſey-Woolſey* Pamphleter. But pray let's hear the reaſon why his *Lordſhip's* aſſeveration is falſe in Divinity? *viz. Becauſe to impoſe in the Worſhip of God, as neceſſary circumſtances of it, things confeſſedly trivial and needleſſe is not juſtifiable.* (1). I wonder to what old woman *D. E.* was lately Confeſſour? for I think none elſe would ever have made an acknowledgment that the things were trivial and needleſs, which ſhould be, or are, impoſed. Becauſe that we aſſert that things, though of ſmall moment in themſelves, may have annexed to them dangerous conſequences, therefore *D. E.* collects that we confeſſe them triviall or needleſſe. But (2). Doth not our Author admirably prove the falſity of the Lord Biſhop's poſition? Is not his conſequence ſtrong? To impoſe things trivial and needleſſe is not juſtifiable; Ergo an offence to which a diſproportionable penalty is annexed; muſt not be judged of by it's dangerous conſequences. *D. E.* ſpeaks nothing to the purpoſe, Ergo, His Lordſhips propoſition is falſe in Divinity, And actions ſhould not be judged of by their danger. Yea but

The Church and it's peace, is much more endangered by the preſſing of ſuch things doubtfull. I wonder who told *D. E.* That the indifference of any of theſe things (*viz.* impoſed Circumſtances) were queſtionable or doubtful? or if they were doubtful, who told him that it was not in the Churches power, or that it was not her duty to determine of them? Or that it would incurre perill by impoſing them? I ſhould rather ſuppoſe, that the not giving men leave to diſſent in ſmall matters, would keep them from taking occaſion to cauſe a diviſion in things of greater importance. Whereas the gratifying ſome with a little toleration, hath, and would again, animate either them or others to attempt

Schiſms

Schisms of greater bulke and proportion. The allowance of an inch makes many presume on an ell. But I pray thee (candid Reader) lend me a little of thy spleen to laugh at a pretty expression of our Pamphleter. *From such impositions*, saith he, *it follows, that* (*though We ought not*) *yet we lawfully may refuse to submit unto them.* A man, it seems, ought not to rebell, but yet he lawfully may rebell. *D. E.* ought not to shew his back to the drumme head, and undergoe the Lash, but yet *D. E.* lawfully may do it. But why may we lawfully refuse to submit to impositions of this nature, *viz. Because our Saviour did so, in not washing his hands before meat; And the Apostle* (I think he means St. *Paul*) *in the case of Circumcision* But I conceive, our Saviour refused to wash, not in disobedience to the Custome, so much as to shew them the falsity of the reason whereon they built their Custome, *scil.* Supposing that eating with unwashen hands defiled a man; Which opinion our Blessed Saviour refuted by telling the Jewes, that (not what went in, but) what came out from the man occasioned his pollution. Besides we do not read that washing of hands was ratify'd by Authority, but only introduced by frequent practise and tradition. So that Christ only ran counter to a custome, and that will no way authorize our contradicting an imposition. As for that of St. *Paul*'s refusing to circumcise, 'twas to shew the abolition of that Sacrament by the introduction of a new, and this is no president for non-conformists to refuse subscription to circumstances of long continuance, and of necessary injunction, having not the authority of the Messiah for the introduction of any new ones in their room. Moreover we know that St. *Paul* did circumcise *Timothy*, that he might not give occasion of scandall to the Jewes, among whom he then was. If then *D. E.* will needs make the Apostle a pattern for imitation in his non-conforming to an abolish'd Sacrament, and refusing to circumcise *Titus* when he was among the Gentiles. I see not but why I may with farre greater reason urge his Example on the contrary. And since St. *Paul* being among the Jews did circumcise, therefore we may Act. 16. 1,2,3.

well conclude, that amongſt Conformiſts we ought to conforme.

VII Except.

THe Sorites (which *D. E.* termes a Chayn of conſequences) uſed by the Lord Biſhop to prove the neceſſity of impoſition, are (to ſpeake Mr. *Baxter*'s Language) the words of truth and Soberneſſe. viz. *From diverſity in externall rights reſulteth diſlike, thence enmity, thence oppoſition, thence Schiſm in Church, and ſedition in State. The State not ſtanding ſecure without the Church, nor the Church without unity, nor unity without uniformity, nor uniformity without ſtrict impoſition.* To this *D. E.* anſwers, *That it is a meer rope of Sand* (A pretty good Anſwer for one that was gravell'd. Somewhat 'twas that *D. E.* was angry with it, he ſtanding not well affected to any Rope but one of Hemp). But he proceds: *And the parts of his chaine* (it ſeems, a Rope and a Chaine are all one with our Animal: Indeed they are ſomething of Kin, and, if he proceed in his begun courſes, the Chaine may chance to bring him to the Rope). Well but what of the parts? why they *do as little hang together, as Samſon's Foxes did before they were tyed by the Tayles* (I thought ſomething of a Foxe was nigh, the diſcourſe did ſo ſtink) *which courſe the Biſhop hath imitated, not forgetting to put in even the firebrand it ſelfe to make up the Compariſon.* So that this Fellow will needs make the Biſhops book the firebrand. Well, be it ſo, The firebrandcame betwixt the two tayles; The Lord Biſhop's book came between the Book of Mr. *Baxter* and *D. E.* his Pamphlet; how eaſily then hath *D. E.* prov'd that thoſe two laſt were the fox-tayles. And indeed the compariſon is cloſe and genuine, ſince either of them have left a moſt abominable ſcent behind them. But to prove the inſufficiency of his *Lordſhip's Sorites*, we are preſented with three obſervations.

(1) That

(1.) That *there ought to be diversity in external formes, since the Apostles of the Circumcision gave the right hand of fellowship to the Apostle of the Gentiles.* What then? Because the Apostles of the *Jews*, and those of the *Gentiles* did agree; *ergo*, there ought to be diversity of external forms. Still the old consequences! Yea, but they did agree, *Although the external forms of worship were far more different than those of England.* (1.) I'le enquire of *D. E.* where he heard, how he proves, or when he dream'd it? (2.) I'le ask him, what of all that, though we should suppose a difformity in their worship? Peradventure the State of an infant-Church requir'd it. And (though, probably, they did not approve of diversity in Circumstantials, yet) they would not wrangle about Formalities, lest they should deterr others from the Fundamentals. But now the case is alter'd, and a dispensation for recusancy in Circumstance, is so far from gayning others to the Fundamentals, that it encourageth those who have already received the Faith, to the mangling of the Church, and the disjoyning of Christ's Mystical Body.

(2.) He tells us, *That the State may be preserv'd without the Church, as it is evident in those* 300 *years before* Constantine, *when there was no Church at all legally Countenanced.* Still we are troubled with a grosse *Non-sequitur.* As if there were the same reason for a Church newly inoculated and a Church concorporated with the State; when the Church, as such, bears an equall weight with the State, as such. Before *Constantine*, though all the Church had been massacred, yet might the temporall State have stood, yea and triumphed in their bloud; Since those that had the Management of Secular affaires were not members of the Church. But now when discrepancy of worship proves matters of faction; when all that rule in, or submit to, the temporall State, must (as also Church-members) participate and share in the fortunes of one or other part of the Church; the downfall of the one unavoydably involves the dissolution of the other. So that when the frabrick of the Church, decayes in a Voluminous ruine, the State must

alſo crack in a proportionable Emphaſis of a broken frame.

3. *Unity in heart and ſpirit doth not in the leaſt depend upon Uniformity but on charity*, i. e. *A Chriſtian and candid forbearance in things circumſtantiall, while we agree in eſſentialls.* I admire, in what Authour *D. E.* read this definition of Charity? we uſe to terme it, *Amare Deum, ſupra omnia, propter ſeipſum; & vicinum, æquè ac noſmet, propter Deum.* So that the part of charity looking towards our Neighbour, teacheth us to love him as our ſelves, but ſtill for God's ſake. Now, whether this Charity depends upon unity, and conſequently on uniformity, or elſe Unity and uniformity on Charity, will eaſily appear. If the breach of charity hangs upon diſunion, and diſunion upon difformity; then Charity dedends upon union, and union on uniformity: But the Antecedent is manifeſtly true, that the rending of the Church breaks the bonds of Charity, in that it detracts from the honour of God; without which, the love of our Neighbour is no Charity: and that this rending or diſunion depends on difformity, in that difference of circumſtantials cauſeth heart-burnings, and animoſities. Whereupon *D. E.* is clearly miſtaken in the dependance; Charity depending on, and being proportion'd to Unity, not Unity to Charity. But what if we ſhould concede Unity to depend on Charity? yet ſtill *D. E.* is in his old *non ſequitur*. For Unity would ſtill depend (though mediately) on Uniformity, ſince Charity (whereon he would have Unity depend) would be preſerved by Uniformity, and broken by Difformity. *D. E.* his candid forbearance then of one another in Circumſtantials, is ſo far from being Charity, that it is the infringement of it; ſince ſuch a forbearance or connivence at Non-conformiſts, would, by the rending of the Church (which would unavoydably follow) tend to Gods diſhonour. But *D. E.* is not farther out in this, than in that which follows: viz. *The Warrs did not ariſe from the Separation of Conſcientious diſſenters* (in this he ſpeaks truth, for it was not Conſcience, but Obſtinacy counſelled them

to

to diſſent) *but from the fury of unconſcionable impoſers.* But ſure it was diſſenting cauſed the rigid impoſing. And then if it muſt be Impoſing that broach'd the Warres, it may thanke forward Diſſenting. Which ſame diſſenting practiſes whether they may not produce a relapſe into their former conſequences, I would fain have thoſe recuſants conſider; Unleſſe they delight in Animoſities, and like *Salamanders* long bath'd in flames diſguſt the influence of a milder Element.

VIII. Except.

D. *E.* Pretends to have great inſight into the Eccleſiaſtick laws of the *French* and *Dutch* Proteſtants;(And probably he may, for his underſtanding hath been beyond ſea, a long time). But yet he never read of any *Impoſition of ſtanding, ſitting, or any other poſture, at the Adminiſtration of the Euchariſt.* But yet if there were, ſaith he, *it doth not juſtifie our impoſition of kneeling.* (1) *Becauſe the queſtion is*, de jure, *whether it be lawfull for them to preſcribe any one poſture. D. E.* might do well to ſtep over, and convince thoſe Churches of their Errour. But why may not they enjoin one particular Poſture; ſince an *Oleo* and mixture of carriage at the reception of the Sacrament is not only undecent; But (when every man ſhall adopt to himſelf a frame of deportment) they will approach the Lords Table either with affectation, partially applauding their own judgments, or elſe with regret maligne the diſſimilary compoſure of others. Either of which are enough to render a Man an unworthy receiver. Beſides though ſome have made it their endeavour to prove the carriage of the Apoſtles diſcrepant from ours; Yet none ever dream'd that they had a plurality of poſtures among themſelves. (2). Saith *D. E. None of thoſe poſtures*, uſ'd by other Churches, *are ſo lyable to exception, as kneeling.* I anſwer, that they are more lyable to exception, Sitting partaking much of ir-

irreverence; and ſtanding being not ſuch an ample expreſſion of humility and devotion. In *kneeling* there is an obligation of Decency. For conſidering the importance of the ordinance, and the Majeſty of the perſon with whom we have to do; I know no reaſon but that the moſt ſubmiſſe and reverential ſituation of the body ſhould (even proſcinded from an enjoyning power) be obligatory, and more than indifferent.

But why is kneeling ſo liable to Exception? (1) *Becauſe it varies moſt from the old form.* Believe him who will! Which, I pray, doth *ſtanding*, *ſitting*, or kneeling more border on diſcumbency? But what though it ſhould moſt differ from the old form? although *D. E.* cannot prove it. They in their demeanours conſulted conveniency; we, to expreſſe our devotion. But (2) *Kneeling hath been monſtrouſly abuſ'd by the Papiſts to Idolatry.* What though? doth the abuſe of a thing argue the illegitimacy of it's uſe? I believe then that *D. E.* never ſaith his Praiers on his knees. Or probably he ſaith them in his ſleep, becauſe waking praiers were abuſ'd by Papiſts in their Vigils; and it may be, this made many Presbyterians wink and pray. Or (which is moſt likely) *D. E.* never ſaith any Praiers at all, becauſe Papiſts have made the Saints groan with their innumerable Supplications, and have made Pictures the Objects of clamorous Petitions. *D. E.* ſure never puts the Bible to the penance of a conſultation, becauſe the moſt damned Hereticks have father'd their pretenſions thereon, and have had recourſe to Scripture for the Patronage of their Poſitions.

IX. Except.

D. *E.* complains again of the injury was done in reviling the whole body of *Presbyterians for the faults of Mr.* Baxter, *upon ſuppoſition that he is a Presbyterian.* Suppoſition that he is a Presbyterian? Why will any think otherwiſe?

therwiſe? I cannot conceive but Mr. *Baxter* would repute it a Calumny of the greateſt Magnitude, for any to exclude him out of the number, nay not to ſuppoſe him their ringleader. Do not others, (yea and his own over-weening fancy) look on him as the pillar of their reeling Cauſe? Do not all ſtand indicted of Hereſie in the thoughts of the reſt, who ſwarve from his poſitions, and comply not with an eager ſubſcription to what he depoſeth? It ſeems (though *D. E.* ſcruples not to affirm it) the Age is not too wiſe to be gull'd with an Αὐτὸς ἔφη. But our Animadverter would have every man *bear his own burden.* And (although he doth not expreſſe it, yet) he hath a pretty good reaſon for ſuch a requeſt, for he knows Presbyterians to be of that ſort of Animals which is very good at bearing. But he wonders, in *what Bible the Biſhop found that he might aſperſe a whole order of men for the pretended miſcarriage of one?* I wonder in what book (I will not ſay Bible, for I conjecture that he little troubles that) did *D. E.* read that a man might not reprove a whole Society, for the reall miſdemeanour of their ſuppoſed Chieftain? Or, where did he find that there is reaſon to rebandy the phraſe—— *Crimine ab uno Diſce omnes*, upon the order of Epiſcopacy, becauſe of the Lord of *Worceſter's* dreamed fault; ſince he pretends not to ſuch an univerſality on the one ſide, as Mr. *Baxter* doth on the other. But not to gratifie the petulant and Sawcy humour of our Pamphleter, I would beſeech him to know that the Sentence by him retorted, is ſo farre from extending to *Diſce omnes*, that it is not yet come to *Crimine ab uno.* And *D. E.* is ſo farre from truly introducing the reſt of the Biſhops as guilty, that he hath not yet prov'd one of them Criminal.

Hitherto D. E. tells us, *he was willing to propoſe his exceptions* (or rather to blazon his ignorance) *but he will leave it to ſome abler pen* (as he had need) *to convince the Biſhop and the world that it is not now time to ſow tares.* No nor any other ſeed, ſo long as there are ſuch Geeſe as *D. E.* to devour it. I wonder what Seed this is which our Pamphle-

ter

ter hath ſowed? 'Tis ſcarce ſo good as *Infœlix lolium.* It is ſome kin to hemp-ſeed, and may in time do him a courteſie in the return. But the Reaſon, I pray, why a man may not in this Age ſow tares? *O, The Age is too wiſe to take every thing for Oracle which the Biſhop's paſſion dictates.* No, nor yet whatever *D. E.* ſhall proclaim; although there be ſome Reaſon for it, Since the Spirit in him, ſpake (like that of *Jupiter Hammon*) out of an Image.

But yet before parting, *D. E.* will give us a taſte *of the Reverend Father's deep wiſdome.* And I will ſee how well his ſhallow wit will be able to fathom it.

I. SAith *D. E. The Biſhop declaimes ſo fiercely, as if he would crack his Girdle. Girdle?* He was reſolv'd amongſt ſo much non-ſenſe to have one word that was *Canonical.* But in the ſpace doth he not ſtrain ſo hard his railing vein, that he hath burſt that point whereto the waſtband of his Britches ſhould truſt, which makes him ſo facily liable to the Laſh? But what is that againſt which there are ſuch Declamations? *viz. Againſt thoſe who force all Communicants to come unto them, and be particularly examined before their Admiſſion to the Sacrament.* And what can *D. E.* ſay againſt any mans exploding ſuch a Cuſtome? or in vindication of ſuch a Practiſe? Only this, *That they were but examined once for all, as likewiſe the Biſhop allows Catechiſing.* But I hope there is not the ſame reaſon for Catechizing, and for Presbyterian Examination; Catechizing being a facile and preſcribed way of informing men in their duty, and exhibiting to them a compendious means of knowing the opinion of the Church in matters of faith and practiſe. Whereas (1). Examinations, whereby *Presbyterians* ſifted men, was many times in Queſtions unheard-of and peradventure ſcarce well underſtood of the examiner. As, *How long have you been converted? What method did the Spirit uſe in your Converſion?* And a multitude of Queries of the ſame Hackle. (2). The main thing that makes their Examination obvious to exception, is; In that the

the Miniſter had recourſe to his own private principles and ſingle perſwaſion for the Queſtions he propoſed; Inſomuch that if the Anſwer were found to diſcover a glimpſe of an opinion that ſwarv'd from the Maxims of his private and pick'd Church, it did adminiſter ſufficient Occaſion of renunciation. Which practiſe how laudable it was, let any (but *D. E.*) judge. This *D. E.* thinks himſelf ingenious when he tells us next, *That the Biſhop did well this cold weather to ſet up a man of ſtraw, and catch himſelf a heat with threſhing it.* To ſee how much the Man's miſtaken! Tis I have been at the pains all this while to threſh this man of ſtraw, although I have not ſweat for't.

2. *D. E.* thinks it inadvertency in the Lord Biſhops wiſh, *That the Authors of all ſuch books as defend the Covenant would burn them themſelves to ſave the Hangman a labour.* But I cannot enough applaud the Counſell. For the Sacrificing and devoting ſuch Books voluntarily to the flames, might in ſome degree expiate the Authours crimes in a burnt offering. But as yet I ſee no reaſon any man hath (though our Pamphleteer thinks the contrary) to bawk the repetition of the Covenant to the infamy of ſuch as perpetuate its remembrance, and keep the memory thereof enſhrin'd in thoſe unhappy ſheets, wherein they have wrapped it's Apology. I would not have *D. E.* dread the Dilemmatical inconveniences that would accrue to thoſe who ſhould attempt the defence of that Oath. Let him not fear being *goared with the hornes* (as he phraſes it) of a *Syllogiſmus cornutus*, ſince an *Argumentum baculinum* doth better ſuit with his capacity. But he hath a great tenderneſſe *for the lawfull part of an Oath, after that it is ſolemnly taken.* Here he hints to us that ſome part of the Covenant was lawful, and gives a ſilent approbation of ſomething in that, which the wiſdome of the Parliament wholly diſallowed. *But it hath been taken by thoſe who have ventured their lives to ſignalize their Loyalty.* But have not many of them ſince given a pregnant teſtimony how ill they have reſented the thing it ſelf, as alſo how utterly they deteſted that compulſive power which forced it upon them, by a ſpontane-

ous and unengaged care for its abolition? Wherefore, (though *D. E.* like a friend, takes care for it's peaceable interment *thinking it's Aſhes might have reſted quietly, better than have blown about by the Biſhops furious breath, ſince it was burnt by publique Authority*, yet) I would enquire, (Since *THAT* which was the Cinders from whence great flames had their eruption, and diſplay'd themſelves in a generall conflagration, is now reduc'd to aſhes) why ſhould thoſe Volumes that have engaged in it's patronage preſerve it's reliques unextinct, and gratifie the Covenant in a poſthume-life?

3. *D. E. Can never enough commend the Biſhop's wiſdome in reſolving never to write again.* And I can never ſufficiently applaud our Pamphleteer, who took courage to defie one, which not only ſcorn'd to foul his fingers with him, but alſo had determin'd not to anſwer. But that which *D. E.* Ironically ſpeaks; I ſeriouſly repeat, as ſeeing high *wiſdome in his Lordſhip's reſolve againſt writing*: For why ſhould he grate his daies, and waſte his Spirits in replying to the indefatigable Lungs and pens of any railing Presbyterians. Since he might acquieſce in that plenary refutation of his detractour, and the full ſatisfaction which his Letter contains and preſents to any that ſhould enquire into his belyed proceedings with Mr. *Baxter*. And I think there's none can finde therein either errour or inſufficiency (as to the matter it comprehends) unleſſe ſuch as are of *D. E.* his inſolent and pedantique humour, which prompted him ſo magiſterially to vent his Non-ſenſe, even to the glowing of a ſober eare. Such, I confeſſe (if there be any ſuch,) as he may cry out (though ridiculouſly enough) *that the Biſhops reſolved Silence reſembles a School-boy, who after a box on the eare lent to another, cunningly retreats.* But I ſhould ſuppoſe it rather School-boy-like to give him a box on the eare, whom he knows to be peremptorily reſolv'd againſt retaliation, and determin'd not to ſtrike again. How much doth this Similitude of the Pamphleteer ſpeak the Author, and ſufficiently evince his underſtanding to be *ſub ferula?* How doth his extravagant and *nil ad rem* treatiſe, argue that his witts

play

play Truant? And his very name (*viz. D. E.*) import that he is in his *A. B. C.*

But to see the vaulting and salacious humour of our Animadverter in the skipping of his comparison: from a School-boy to a Gyant. If saith he, *Goliah* (he means the Bishop) *shall defy Israel, and retire from the field, with only shewing his teeth. The Philistins will hardly thank him.* But I say, that if *Goliah* (I mean Mr. *Baxter*) armed with a weaver's beam (though in his eye) shall thunder defyance against the *King and his Host*, Why may not *David* retire upon the conquest of his *Monstrous foe?*

But since *D. E.* pronounceth it not the part of a Champion to shew his teeth only and and run away; I would advise him (when ever he is to engage with his Adversary) not to shew his teeth, but his eares, the more formidable and scaring objects by farre. Our Author hastening now towards an end, will *not stand to determine whether the deportment of the Bishop may make the rest of the Prelates, judge him of kin to* quickly-defeated *Goliah or not*? Neither will I contest much about it. Only *D. E.* his impudence perswades me to believe himself of some affinity with *Goliah. For Goliah* had an helmet of brasse, and our Champion's face is of the same mettal.

Hitherto I have followed the Chase; But since the Dragooner hath pleas'd to retire to the protection of his pretended honourable Patron, I shall leave both him and his Letter of intelligence to their Covert, expecting to hear farther the next return. Till when I shall presume to retreat to the Garrison of the Readers courtesie (from whence I first issued and) where I dare not despair of Security and Shelter.

FINIS.